

Appl. No. 09/444,359

Amdt. dated May 9, 2005

Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2005

PATENT**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1, 3-17 and 19-42 were pending in this application. No claims have been amended, added, or canceled. Hence, claims 1, 3-17 and 19-42 remain pending.

Reconsideration of the subject application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-17, 19-33, 37-38 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,618,594 to Myers, *et al.* (hereinafter "Myers").

Claims 34 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Myers in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,577,857 to Rodrigues, *et al.* (hereinafter "Rodrigues").

Claims 35-36 and 40-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Myers, in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,212,377 to Dufour, *et al.* (hereinafter "Dufour").

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of all claims since the cited references do not teach all the claim limitations, either explicitly or impliedly. For example, claim 1 includes the limitation, "receiving from the mobile subscriber user-defined, location-dependent rules associated with at least one telephone service subscribed to by the mobile subscriber, wherein each rule received from the mobile subscriber at the wireless network includes a specification for at least one geographic area associated with the mobile subscriber and rules for processing the at least one telephone service for the mobile subscriber when the mobile subscriber is in one of the geographic areas" (emphasis added). Myers does not teach this limitation.

Myers appears to teach methods by which a user may obtain wireless phone service outside his home area. While establishing the service, the user "defines a user zone ... as well as the desired service type and duration" (col. 4, ll. 35-37). The service provider then "proposes a contract ... which is either accepted, rejected, or modified by the user" (col. 4, ll. 37-39). These teachings of Myers fail to anticipate the Applicants' claimed invention.

Appl. No. 09/444,359
Amdt. dated May 9, 2005
Reply to Office Action of February 7, 2005

PATENT

More specifically, Myers fails to teach "rules for processing the at least one telephone service." In fact, nowhere does Myers even mention "rules." Myers appears to be limited to merely establishing service with a user temporarily out of his home calling area. Myers does not address individual rules for processing services. Hence, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the cited references.

Claim 17 includes a similar limitation and is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons. Further, the remaining claims depend from either claim 1 or claim 17 and are believed to be allowable, at least for the reasons stated above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



Irvin E. Branch
Reg. No. 42,358

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
IEB:arl
60444064 v1